UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,726	09/22/2003	Chaitanya Dev Sareen	60001.0284US01/305087.1	9701
Leonard J. Hop	7590 03/25/200 e	EXAMINER		
Merchant & Go		ANWARI, MACEEH		
P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2144	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/667,726	SAREEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	MACEEH ANWARI	2144				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 De</u>	ecember 2007					
•	action is non-final.					
<i>,</i> —	/					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
• 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 3- 4, 6- 8, 12- 18</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1, 3- 4, 6- 8, 12- 18</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:						

Art Unit: 2144

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendments filed on 12/21/2007. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 12 & 14-17 were amended and claims 2, 5, 9-11 & 19-20 were canceled. No other claims have been amended, canceled, or newly presented. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 12-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. **Claim 3** recites the limitation "a second user interface dialog box". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner will interpret this as a third user interface dialog box.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Syroid & Leuf "Outlook 2000 in a Nutshell" O'Reilly, April 01, 2000.

Claim1: A method for identifying to a user the cause of an event occurring within a personal information manager, the method comprising: maintaining at the personal information manager a rule comprising at least one condition and at least one action that is performed when the at least one condition is satisfied,

Art Unit: 2144

wherein the at least one condition comprises receiving at least one electronic mail message and wherein the at least one action comprises displaying a first user interface dialog box indicating that the at least one electronic mail message has been received (Figure 6-12 and pages 1-3; send and receive e-mails, address book and Microsoft outlook); performing an evaluation to determine whether the at least one condition is satisfied, wherein performing the evaluation comprises performing the evaluation when the at least one electronic mail message has been received (Figure 6-15 - 6-19 and pages 8; mail rules); performing the at least one action in response to determining that the at least one condition is satisfied (Figure 6-15 - 6-19 and pages 8; mail rules and notifications); receiving a request to identify the cause of the performance of the at least one action (Figure 6-15 - 6-19 and pages 8; mail rules, triggers and notifications); and in response to receiving the request, identifying the rule to the user, wherein identifying the rule to the user comprises displaying a second user interface dialog box comprising a list identifying each of the at least one electronic messages indicating which of the at least one condition that has been satisfied (Figure 6-19 and pages 8; pop-up notification).

Claim 3: Wherein the first user interface dialog box comprises the user interface object that, when selected, displays a second user interface dialog box that allows the user to edit the identified rule (Figure 6-15 - 6-20 and pages 18-19; mail rules and rules wizard).

Claim 4: Wherein receiving a request to identify the cause of the performance of

Art Unit: 2144

the at least one action comprises receiving a selection of the user interface object (Figure 6-15 - 6-20 and pages 18-19; mail rules, notification and rules wizard).

Claims 6- 8, 12- 14 & 15- 18 are substantially the same as claims 1, 3- 4 and are thus rejected for reasons similar to those in rejecting claims 1, 3- 4.

Response to Arguments

- 6. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 12-18** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 7. Applicant has had an opportunity to amend the claimed subject matter, and has failed to modify the claim language to distinguish over the prior art of record by clarifying or substantially narrowing the claim language. Thus, Applicant apparently intends that a broad interpretation be given to the claims and the Examiner has adopted such in the present and previous Office action rejections. See In re Prater and Wei, 162 USPQ 541 (CCPA 1969), and MPEP 2111.
- 8. Applicant employs broad language, which includes the use of word, and phrases, which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly and as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993).

9. Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response, and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly defines the claimed invention.

Examiner Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in its entirety as potentially teaching of all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2144

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MACEEH ANWARI whose telephone number is (571)272-7591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00 PM ES.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on 571-272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

M.A. /William C. Vaughn, Jr./ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144